

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested. In the present response, claims 1, 6, and 10-20 have been canceled, and claims 2-5 and 7-9 have been amended. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 remain pending in this application.

Formal matters

Claim 6 has been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form because it is a multiple dependent claim and because it fails to further limit the subject matter of a parent claim. These objections are now moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of claim 6.

Claims 9 and 10 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The objection to claim 10 is now moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of that claim. The objection to claim 9 has been cured by appropriate amendment; more particularly, claim 9 has been recast in independent form to include all limitations of amended claim 2 (which has been indicated as having allowable subject matter).

Claims 3, 6, and 8-10 have been objected to because of various informalities. In response:

- (i) Claim 3 has been amended substantially in accordance with Examiner's suggestion.
- (ii) The objections to claims 6 and 10 are now moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of those claims.
- (iii) Claim 8 has not been amended in accordance with Examiner's suggestions. Because claim 8 has been amended to depend on claim 2 (rather than claim 6, which has been canceled), the presence of the word "an" immediately prior to the terms "amplifier" and "oscillator" is necessary in order to provide proper antecedent basis for those two terms.

(iv) Claim 9 has not been amended in accordance with Examiner's suggestion. As previously discussed, claim 9 has been recast as an independent claim and is now believed to be in proper form.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the remaining claims 2-5 and 7-9 are now in compliance with all formal requirements.

Substantive matters

Claims 2 and 6-8 have been indicated as allowable with certain provisos. In the present response, claims 2 and 7-8 have been appropriately amended, while claim 6 has been canceled due to issues of form. More particularly:

(i) Claim 2 has been recast in independent form to include all limitations of its base claim (i.e., claim 1). Accordingly, claim 2 is now allowable.

(ii) Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to depend on claim 2 (rather than claim 6, which has been canceled). Accordingly, claims 7 and 8 are now allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 2. Moreover, claims 7 and 8 include additional limitations that render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the prior art.

Thus, as amended, claims 2 and 7-8 are now in a condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 9-10 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent 3,924,155). The rejections of claims 1 and 10 are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of those claims. The rejections of claims 3-5 and 9 are respectfully traversed, for the following reasons:

(i) Claims 3 and 5 have been amended to now depend on claim 2 (rather than claim 1). Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3 (and, thereby, indirectly dependent on claim 2). Thus, claims 3-5 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 2, which has been indicated as allowable.

Moreover, claims 3-5 include additional limitations that render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the prior art.

(ii) Claim 9 has been recast in independent form to include all limitations of amended claim 2. Thus, claim 9 is allowable on that basis.

Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 7-9 are now in a condition for allowance.

Applicant notes that claims 11-20 (which were added by a Preliminary Amendment dated June 26, 2003) have apparently not been considered by the Examiner. Nevertheless, Applicant has requested cancellation of those claims in order to expedite prosecution of this application.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, passing of this case is now in order. Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's agent by telephone if such communication may be helpful in the further examination of this case. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On 23 December 2004
(Date of Deposit)

Kenneth D. Labudda, Reg. No. 41,134
Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered rep.

Kenneth D. Labudda 12/23/2004
Signature Date

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Weirich

by: Kenneth D. Labudda 12/23/04
Kenneth D. Labudda
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,134
OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.
Phone: (847) 726-6448
FAX: (847) 726-6599